Subject: Re: Chat with Dan COLLINS
From: Barrett Brown <barriticus@gmail.com>
Date: 1/30/10, 1:23 PM
To: Dan COLLINS <vermontaigne@gmail.com>

Howdy-

I didn't mean to sound harsh, and I'm not offended; just been tired lately and perhaps a bit cranky. Certainly you're under no obligation to denounce or even address anyone's behavior, and no blogger/commentator should have to, or we'd all be too busy to discuss actual issues. I do wonder, though, if you consider McCain to be a more respectable person than Johnson.

Anyway, I'm about to write the formal announcement for the media confrontation/ blogosphere improvement project, which will contain some more details about how this all will work (although some of it, as I've mentioned, is still being decided based on the input we're getting from bloggers and blog readers alike). I'll send you a link when it's up; would like to get your continued input if possible.

Have a good weekend; I've got a cat sitting on my chest, so things are going pretty well on my end.

Thanks,

Barrett Brown
Brooklyn, NY

On Sat, Jan 30, 2010 at 10:07 AM, Dan COLLINS <vermontaigne@gmail.com> wrote:

> **These messages were sent while you were offline.**
>
> 10:07 AM **Dan**: Barrett, I'm sorry if I've offended you, but look . . . I'm a minor presence on the intarwebs, and on Twitter, and yet I'm asked continually to justify the behavior of my acquaintance. Recently, for example, Tommy Christopher was on about Rush Limbaugh, I think it was, saying something stupid that might discourage people from donating for Haitian relief. Simply as a matter of my perceived political sympathies, since I don't listen to radio unless I'm in my car, and I don't watch TV, I was told that it was incumbent upon myself either to defend or denounce some kind of nitwit proposition. And when, having complied with this imperious request, I asked what did he think of Martha Coakley's role in the Amirault case, he said simply that he was unfamiliar with

the facts. This was after I'd gone to his site to read the entirety of the screed. So, please excuse me if I think it's entirely a mug's game, this business of being asked to pronounce on the mreits or demerits of whoever it's assumed you're related to by some mutual sympathy. And Charles doesn't particularly anger me; I just think that he's become a bit of a drama queen. I think that his behavior towards commenters has been unseemly. And I think that like Jeff, he has become obsessed with the issue of "loyalty."

10:13 AM Or, as i've recently averred, I'm not as much interested in people's backgrounds as their foregrounds.